

## United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
09/888,856	06/25/2001	Daren L. Dance	1192	1987	
30748 75	90 12/08/2006		EXAM	EXAMINER	
INNOVATION PARTNERS		STEVENS, THOMAS H			
540 UNIVERSI SUITE 300	TY DRIVE		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
PALO ALTO, CA 94301			2123		

DATE MAILED: 12/08/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

## **Advisory Action**

Application No.	Applicant(s)		
09/888,856	DANCE ET AL.		
Examiner	Art Unit		
Thomas H. Stevens	2123		

Advisory Addison	09/000,000	DANGE ET AL.				
Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief	Examiner	Art Unit				
	Thomas H. Stevens	2123				
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence add	ress			
THE REPLY FILED <u>20 November 2006</u> FAILS TO PLACE THIS	S APPLICATION IN CONDITION F	OR ALLOWANCE.				
. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:						
a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing date of the final rejection.  b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.  Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN						
TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f). Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).  NOTICE OF APPEAL						
2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).  AMENDMENTS						
3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will <u>not</u> be entered because  (a) They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);						
<ul> <li>(b) ☐ They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);</li> <li>(c) ☒ They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or</li> </ul>						
(d) They present additional claims without canceling a NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).	_	ected claims.				
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).  5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):						
6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).						
7.  For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is pro The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:	☑ will not be entered, or b) ☐ wi vided below or appended.	ll be entered and an e	explanation of			
Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to:						
Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected: <u>1-29</u> .	•					
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:  AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE						
<ol> <li>The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, by because applicant failed to provide a showing of good an was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).</li> </ol>	ut before or on the date of filing a N id sufficient reasons why the affidat	otice of Appeal will <u>no</u> vit or other evidence is	ot be entered s necessary and			
<ol> <li>The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessar</li> </ol>	overcome <u>all</u> rejections under appe y and was not earlier presented. S	al and/or appellant fa see 37 CFR 41.33(d)(	ils to provide a 1).			
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER	on of the status of the claims after e	ntry is below or attacl	hed.			
11.   The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:  See Continuation Sheet.						
12. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s).						
13.  Other: ,	fuit	the				
Anthony Knight						
upervisory Patent Examiner						
Group 3600						

## **Continuation Sheet (PTO-303)**

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: the amended claims reflect intended use (i.e., "calculating at least one production quantity") and thus do not place the claims in statutory condition. As stated in the previous advisory action (10/10/06) the claims recite an abstract idea of calculating a production quantity without a useful and tangible result; in other words, there's no mention of an improvement, goal and/or substantial purpose to calulating production quantities that take into account downtime of any controller of a tool group (summary of invention section in the specification has the same problem).